



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,894	04/15/2004	Hua-Jun Zeng	MS1-1890US	8978
22801	7590	04/22/2008		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER				
LE, JESSICA N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2161				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/825,894		ZENG ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	JESSICA N. LE		2161	

All Participants:

(1) Jessica Le, Examiner.

(2) Beatrice Koempel-Thomas, Applicant's Representative.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Advisory Action mailed 04/04/2008

Claims discussed:
Claim 1

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 5:45 pm (E.T)

/Apu Mofiz/
 SPE, Art Unit 2161

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Per response to the message regarding to Advisory Action mailed 04/04/2008 from Applicant's Representative, Ms. Beatrice Koempel-Thomas, examiner had contacted/replied with explanation that since Applicants had changed the limitation of allowance subject matter of claim 1, e.g., changed the "term j" to the "ith vector's jth term". Also, Ms. Koempel-Thomas and examiner further discussed about the "x" in the formula of claim 1, e.g., $W_{ij} = TF_{ij} \times \log(N/DF_j)$. As noted that this "x" was rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph as insufficient antecedent basis by examiner in Office Action mailed 10/16/2006. Then, in response to this Office Action, e.g., Arguments/Remarks filed 02/05/2007 by attorney Brian G. Hart (Reg. No 44,421), Applicants had interpreted the use of the "x" in this formula/equation represents a "multiplication operation" (see Arguments/Remarks filed 02/05/2007, page 26).